

Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3755) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3396, DEFENSE OF MARRIAGE ACT

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-666) on the resolution (H. Res. 474) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3396) to define and protect the institution of marriage, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3755 and include extraneous and tabular material and charts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 472 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3755.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3755) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. WALKER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 43 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 39½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would call the attention of the Members to the charts beside me. First, a chart depicting the expenditures of the

U.S. Government in 1962, Jack Kennedy's heyday, when the Federal Government in that fiscal year spent \$106.8 billion with a very minor deficit. The deficit today runs around \$150 billion.

It was a different day, a different era. Half of that was defense, which is depicted in the lower yellow portion of the pie, and roughly one-sixth of the budget, a little bit more than one-sixth, is the nondefense discretionary portion, which includes the programs funded in this bill.

□ 1900

The blue portion refers to the entitlements, which at that time consisted of Social Security and welfare and various other mandatory spending programs. The red is interest on the debt, which then was a "big" \$7 billion.

Times have changed, Mr. Chairman. Today—for fiscal 1997—the chart looks entirely different. More than half is blue, the mandatory portion of the budget, which is now Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, welfare and other mandatory programs. The total amount now that we propose to spend is \$1.6 trillion compared to \$106 billion in fiscal 1962.

Today we spend 15 times more than we spent back in Jack Kennedy's day. As I say, half of it is for mandatory spending. We raise most of the money, and we transfer it to other people. We tax the American people and pass it on to the next guy.

The discretionary portion looks entirely different. Before, half of the whole budget was defense; now it is only one-sixth. But the other sixth, or the other half of the third, represents discretionary spending which is now about \$269 billion, and a good portion of what is in this bill makes up that amount.

Actually some of what is in this bill is also funded in the blue, or the mandatory portion, but what is significant about this chart is the red. The significant of the red on this chart is the fact that it has grown disproportionate to the entire pie, which itself has grown by 15 times since 1962. The red represents the interest on the debt.

Within the next year or so the red, the interest that we pay on the debt, the borrowing of \$100 billion, \$200 billion, \$300 billion a year over the last many years, is now rapidly approaching the same amount of money and soon will, exceed what we spend on the defense of this Nation, our first priority under the Constitution of the United States.

So I have heard various Members from the other side of the aisle troop down here and say we have to take care of the little children, the infirm, the elderly, we have to take care of the disabled and people who cannot help themselves, and my answer is if we do not get a handle on this problem, all of those people along with every one of us is in deep trouble.

The interest on the debt is the first thing the Government must pay. Oth-

erwise we default. If we do not want to default, we have to pay the interest on the debt even before we worry about the security of our Nation and of every man woman and child in this Nation.

If we do not get that interest on the debt under control, if we do not get this borrowing in control, that tendency that has caused us to borrow up to \$100, \$200, to \$300 billion a year, because we are spending that much more than we receive every single year with the exception of perhaps 3 years since World War II, frankly, the red color on the chart will encompass everything else, and we will not be able to afford anything else.

So I would say take care of the little children first by balancing our books. Now, the other side will say, well, we are balancing them on the backs of the children. I say that is not true. The fact is we are making significant savings. In fiscal year 1995 we saved a net of \$16 billion, in fiscal year 1996 a net of an additional \$20 billion. In fiscal year 1997, which we are in now, it will be another 15 to \$20 billion. Minimum, a net savings to the American taxpayer of \$53 billion under what was appropriated by the Democrats when they had control last in the Congress.

If we look at President Clinton's budget compared to where he would take us had he had a Democratic Congress, we are saving around \$80 billion, all of that out of the discretionary spending. That savings is achieved by cutting everything fairly and equitably.

Is it out of education? No. First of all, the Federal Government only spends roughly 5 percent of the entire education budget. This is the chart showing what the United States spends on education. State and local governments spend 95 percent; the Federal Government puts up an additional 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that despite the fact that we have heard this hue and cry about cutting the people that are least able, total nondefense discretionary spending is going up. The fact is, yes, we are eliminating duplicative programs. We have cut unnecessary programs. We have already eliminated a number of programs; gone from 655 in 1995, to 515 in 1996, and to 464 in 1997, in this bill.

At the same time the savings generated by these eliminations are, in fact, going to the States in the form of block grants, block grants for States and localities to spend the money as they please. Community service block grants has gone up from \$390 to \$490 million. For child care and development programs, it has gone up from \$935 to \$950 million. For social services block grant, it has gone up from \$2.4 to \$2.5 billion. And for maternal and child block grants, it has gone up by \$3 million from \$678 to \$681 million. We are spending more, not less, on block grants.

Student aid is going up. The student aid has increased. Maximum Pell